



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tion in American history. But the special student must regret that Mr. Roosevelt does not find it possible to regard history as a more jealous mistress, and to give more time, greater thoroughness of investigation, particularly in foreign archives, and more sobriety of judgment to his work.

FREDERICK J. TURNER.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives. By M. P. FOLLETT.
(New York, London, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co.
1896. Pp. xxvi, 378.)

MISS M. P. FOLLETT, in her book, *The Speaker of the House of Representatives*, has made a really notable contribution to the study of the growth of American governmental institutions; and she has, for the first time, put down on paper, for the benefit of the literary class, certain facts which are accepted as truisms by the men who actually shape the developments of our institutions, but to which the merely theoretical students of these institutions have been almost absolutely blind. The very reason why Miss Follett's work is so creditable is a rather severe commentary upon the mental attitude of many of these students. She has studied the subject at first hand; with the *Congressional Record*, *The Debates of Congress*, and the *House Journal*, as the highest authorities, but with frequent reference to the published statements of the chief actors in the various struggles, or of their really competent critics. Above all, she has faced facts as they are; and has not been blinded by seeming analogies between our own and the English system. Unfortunately, the average student of our methods of congressional government cannot rid his mind of the thought that it must be studied in the writings of those who know nothing of the practical work of Congress, and in consequence it is fairly astounding to see how little knowledge these writers usually have of the most important features of their subject, and how idle are their proposed remedies for any existing wrong. A really practical politician is continually irritated at the disregard which the men who merely call themselves practical politicians show for the work of the scholar and student; but this disregard is unfortunately entirely justifiable in many instances. A few years ago a number of very well-meaning students of congressional government conceived the idea that what we needed was parliamentary responsibility, in the English sense. One or two of the leaders of this cult, notably Mr. Woodrow Wilson, were men of marked ability, who have done admirable work in other lines, and who in this instance were misled solely because they did not know, and could not see, the real conditions under which our government worked; but their teachings on this point were as idle as if they had tried to model New York municipal government on Plato's *Republic*. Yet for some years their writings were not answered, because they were regarded with indifference by those who knew enough to answer them, and with reverential awe by those who did not. No man practically acquainted with our governmental methods considered them worth an answer, and the students whose knowl-

edge of these methods was obtained purely from the study of the excellent English writers who wrote on English government, considered them unanswerable. It was not until Mr. Lawrence Lowell took the trouble once for all to demolish them that their theories were seriously refuted. To any man who could study in more than one language, and who had ever read the writings of the great Belgian publicist Emile de Laveleye, they needed no refutation.

Naturally, when students could content themselves with work along such merely imitative lines they could not be expected to do work that was worth doing. The mental attitude that made the one possible made the other impossible; and in consequence the great feature of our recent institutional development, the enormous growth of the speaker's power, was never seriously studied. The first sign of an awakening to its importance was given by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, when two or three years ago he published an article upon "The Speaker's Power," in the *Atlantic Monthly*. I well remember the pleasure this article caused men like Mr. Reed and Mr. Carlisle. Politicians had grown to take it for granted that no so-called student of Congress, if a man of scholarly traditions and college education, would be practically acquainted with even the central features of this subject, and the article came like a revelation. What was there hinted at, or sketched in outline, Miss Follett has now done with a thoroughness and philosophic grasp of her subject that will make her book indispensable to every future student of congressional government. She has collected her facts with indefatigable industry, and grouped them with an admirable sense of proportion and of historic perspective; she has shown the reason and necessity for the growth of the power of the speaker with singular clear-sightedness and skill.

With all of Miss Follett's views it is not necessary to agree. She does not seem to have estimated correctly the relative weight in leadership of Mr. Reed and Mr. Carlisle, and in one place at least she fails to put proper emphasis upon the fact that Mr. Reed made a far greater advance in the development of the speaker's power than any man who ever held the office. But these are slight criticisms. As a whole, her work is marvellously well done. She shows how of necessity the ideal of the speaker as a mere moderator has tended to disappear. Incidentally she shows that this ideal is not a wholesome one. A large proportion of the academic reformers always treat the fact that the speaker is no longer a mere moderator, as a misfortune to be deeply deplored. In reality, as Miss Follett shows, the speakers who have tried to act merely as moderators, and not as party leaders, have invariably failed to do the great and useful work for the nation which has been done by the men who administer the office in accordance with the deep-rooted principles of American institutional growth. The names of the speakers who were moderators and nothing else have now been rightfully forgotten; but the names of the great party leaders, from Clay to Reed and Carlisle, who held the speaker's chair, will always be remembered, and their work was of lasting good to the people.

Miss Follett begins by an excellent study of the speakership in colonial times, and of the status of the president in the Continental Congress. Following this, she has dealt with the present conditions of the speakership, grouping all the facts together for the first time; but perhaps the most important part of her work is found in chapters four to nine, where she deals with the functions of the speaker in their order, and where she discusses with clearness the growth of the three fundamental powers which the speaker has gradually assumed, and the assumption of which has made him a mighty political authority, second only to the president, — the functions of acting against filibustering, of appointing committees, and of recognizing only those members whom he deems entitled to speak. All of these three powers have been savagely inveighed against, notably by many thoroughly well-meaning academic reformers; but Miss Follett shows clearly that it would be an evil thing to have the speaker act as an unbiassed judge, instead of as a party leader, and that it is in the interest of good government that he should wisely, firmly, and boldly exercise the powers, and accept the great responsibilities, which have come to be associated with an office which can now only be successfully filled by a man who is both a great statesman and a great party leader.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Southern Quakers and Slavery. A Study in Institutional History.

[Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. Extra Volume XV.] By STEPHEN B. WEEKS, Ph.D. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1896. Pp. xiv, 400.)

THE sober *format* of this volume and its unalluring title will probably keep the general reader from attempting its perusal, and may even induce the historical student to place it on his shelves with its leaves uncut. Dr. Weeks's labors do not deserve such a fate, however; for he has worked faithfully not merely in a comparatively new field, but also in an interesting one. His monograph will naturally appeal most to members of the Society of Friends, for it is filled with details in which they alone will take great interest; but it will also appeal to every serious student of that now defunct institution of slavery which dominated our history for fully half a century. Its chief interest from the latter point of view lies, I think, in the fact that it brings into relief the witness that a considerable body of people in at least three important Southern States bore for a number of decades to the moral, and, as the Quakers were in the main a thrifty people, to the economic evils of slavery. The witness thus borne by men who migrated by hundreds and thousands from the South is a fact of great importance to the historian who endeavors to determine impartially how far the people of the South are to be blamed for their adherence to an institution which the rest of the civilized world had given up, and which their great revolutionary leaders, like Washington and Jefferson, had denounced in emphatic terms. Dr. Weeks, of course, sees fully the importance of the witness